



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

results of his labours the hope that the compromise that could not be effected eighteen centuries ago may yet be brought about. The spirit of our age greatly favours such a compromise. What the Christian world needs is another Jew, to complete the Trinity of Jewish Reformers, one who shall combine within himself the moral and religious purity of Jesus and the zeal and energy of Paul. He will be the long expected Messiah. His coming will constitute the Second Advent of the Nazarene Master. The time for his coming is drawing nigh. Obsolete forms and meaningless rites are crumbling away. Offensive doctrines are disappearing. The Judaic Jesus is slowly regaining his lost ground. The Ethics of Judaism are gradually supplanting the Gnosticism of Paul. When the Jew shall have completely cast away his obstructive exclusiveness and ceremonialism, and the Christian his Christology, Jew and Gentile will be one."

The desire expressed for the new Jewish Reformer who shall be the "long expected Messiah" is a piece of rhetoric or a metaphor. But the underlying thought is brave and clear. Would that such free and fearless utterances, whether we entirely agree with them or not, were spoken from the pulpits of English synagogues as well as in America.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

ABBÉ LOISY'S "ÉTUDES BIBLIQUES."

Études Bibliques : par ALFRED LOISY (Paris, 1901).

La Religion d'Israël : par ALFRED LOISY (Paris, 1901).

THESE are two small but important pamphlets by a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar and theologian. The second consists mainly of a very clear historical sketch of the origin and development of the Jewish religion; the former, to which I shall here confine myself, is a collection of six essays bearing upon the Inspiration of Scripture and upon Biblical Criticism. Their object, according to the Abbé Loisy's short preface, is "the reconciliation of Catholic dogma and discipline with the scientific study of the Bible."

We are by this time quite familiar with an attempted alliance between Protestant faith and the "higher criticism." The critical "results" which are accepted as consonant with and indeed con-

firmatory of Christianity relate mainly to the Old Testament. The reason for this limitation is apparent; its justification more dubious. But in the Old Testament, and to a far more limited extent in the New, traditional dates and authorships of books, improbable stories and awkward miracles are freely abandoned. In the Bible, as in so many other things, we hear of a growth and a development. The evolution reaches its term in the person and teaching of Jesus, though whether this sudden arrival at perfection and finality with a particular date and person is as "scientific" as the previous growth we are not clearly and cogently informed. In any case the new way of looking at the Bible (and for my own part I largely agree with the theologians) is said to make it at once "more human and more divine." We are extremely familiar with language and arguments of this kind both from Anglicans and Nonconformists.

It would now appear that the same sort of process is going on and the same sorts of things are being said in the Roman Catholic Church. There too an earnest and sincere body of thinkers—far fewer in number I imagine than among Protestants, but yet not without significance—is seeking to reconcile Catholicism with free inquiry and critical results. There too liberal believers are attempting to show that the critical handling of the Bible does no violence to its inspiration, and can well be carried on within the limits and under the sanction of the Infallible Church.

A Jewish reviewer of M. Loisy's books naturally asks himself, When will the Jews follow suit? Protestant believers tell us that criticism is only truly possible outside Rome; M. Loisy tells us, on the contrary, that it is only Catholicism which can absorb critical results and be essentially unaffected by them. Will not some believing and orthodox Jews tell us soon that it is only Judaism which can withstand unharmed the critic's probing?

To what is Jewish silence on this deeply important question to be attributed? I hope our Rabbis and teachers do not really think that Judaism is in a worse case than Christianity, so far as the criticism of the Bible is concerned? or is there less liberty for Jewish Rabbis even than for Roman Catholic priests? M. Loisy has apparently suffered for his outspokenness (*Études*, p. 60, note 3), but he remains a priest. Or are we to believe that Jewish teachers have more insight than their Christian brethren and that they see more clearly whither Criticism must ultimately lead?

I do not suppose that this *is* the reason, but I fancy that there would be a great deal in it if it were! To my thinking, Criticism must end in Christian Unitarianism or in Jewish "Reform." It needs freedom, and in the long run it will produce freedom. The

freedom of Unitarianism and the freedom of Reformed Judaism seem consistent with Criticism; it is hard to think the same of the Thirteen Articles and the Nicene Creed or the Infallible Pope. But it is an immense blessing that many believing Protestants and Roman Catholics do not agree, and it would be a great blessing if many orthodox Jews did not agree.

For the more or less thorough acceptance of Criticism keeps many a pious soul to religion and to God. Honest compromises are needed in the passage from authority to freedom. Religion is made to seem consonant with science and with history; the Bible becomes more vivid; "more human and more divine." Who may dare to throw stones at inconsistency? Is the *Weltanschauung* of the freest of us all of a piece?

Thus it would be well for Jewish divines to consider whether they cannot follow the example of M. Loisy. Criticism led Mr. Addis to leave the Church; but in M. Loisy's case it has apparently only strengthened and confirmed his Catholicism. It is amusing to observe him hitting out every now and then against Rationalism and Protestantism alike. Catholicism alone possesses the key to the full intelligence of the Bible. For the Bible is true, but only the Church can interpret it. Perhaps the orthodox Jew might say by way of parallel that the oral law explains and corrects the Pentateuch: but the Catholic Church, if one can accept its divine authority, is alive and responsive and in a sense susceptible of growth, whereas the oral law has become as much a letter and as moveless a fixity as the written codes themselves.

The problems which are presented to Judaism and to Catholicism by the methods and results of the critics and the historians are not by any means the same. It is not merely that in the one case there is only the Old Testament which has to be considered, whereas in the other case there is the New Testament as well. Christians would argue that the extra book makes an alliance with Criticism far easier, while Jews will insist that the advantage lies with them. But in the special case of Catholicism it would seem that the determining questions must be differently formulated.

In Judaism the crucial problem relates to the Law. If the Pentateuch is not Mosaic, has orthodox Judaism any justification or *raison d'être*? Or again, if the Codes of the Pentateuch are neither consistent with each other nor perfect in morals and religion, what is the consequence? or lastly, if the events and miracles recorded in the Pentateuch did not actually happen, what becomes of the theoretical basis of the orthodox Jewish religion as laid down in the Thirteen Articles of Creed? These are the questions to which

Jewish divines and Rabbis should address themselves, and concerning which they now maintain so obstinate a silence.

But in Catholicism the main question seems to be: Do the authoritative decrees and decisions of the Church allow a critical attitude towards Scripture?

The Church has laid it down that the Bible is "inspired," but it has never exactly defined what is meant by "inspiration" or wherein precisely inspiration consists. It has also said that the Bible contains and teaches no *errors*, but it has apparently allowed much pleasant and desirable uncertainty as to what, in this particular connexion, it means by the term.

The Bible, M. Loisy tells us—and herein he agrees with any liberal Protestant—is a book both human and divine.

"Sans doute, comme livre divin, la Bible est au-dessus de la critique. Le savant n'a pas à vérifier le fait de l'inspiration des Livres saints; ce fait échappe nécessairement à toute constatation scientifique; il est attesté par la révélation et par l'Église, interprète de la révélation; le caractère transcendant de la Bible, comparée aux autres documents de l'antiquité, peut servir à le démontrer indirectement, mais non d'une manière absolue. De même, le savant n'a pas à définir l'objet propre de la révélation divine qui est contenue dans la Bible: une autorité infaillible est nécessaire pour cela, et cette autorité n'appartient qu'à l'Église."

But on the other hand the Bible is not only divine, but also human, and as such, like any other book, susceptible of criticism.

"Si la Bible est véritablement un livre divin, elle est aussi, et dans toute la force du terme, un livre humain. La pensée divine s'est humanisée dans l'esprit des auteurs sacrés; elle s'est pour ainsi dire incarnée dans les Livres saints; elle est devenue analysable. La composition des Écritures et leur conservation se sont accomplies sous une direction particulière de la Providence; mais ce sont des faits historiques susceptibles d'être examinés. De ce chef, en tant que livre humain dans sa forme, ayant son origine et son histoire dans l'humanité, la Bible, par cela même qu'elle participe à la condition générale de tous les livres, et particulièrement des livres anciens, peut devenir l'objet de la critique." (*Études*, p. 11.)

The human and divine elements or aspects of the Bible are welded together into an indivisible unity. You cannot say that one chapter is human and another chapter divine. The whole inspired volume is at once the product of God and the product of man; it is a "supernatural work" which has been interpenetrated from end to end by the divine spirit, so that there is nothing in it which is human and not divine, just as there is nothing in it which is divine and not human (p. 35).

As in a good action of our own it is impossible to analyse that part of it which is due to God's grace and aid, and that part of it which is due to ourselves (the comparison is mine and not our author's), so is it with the Scriptures and their inspiration:—

“L'inspiration des Écritures est à concevoir comme un concours divin dont le but a été de préparer à l'Église une sorte de répertoire pour l'enseignement religieux et moral. Ce concours échappe à notre analyse, comme toutes les opérations divines dans l'ordre naturel et dans l'ordre surnaturel. Mais on peut affirmer, sans crainte de se tromper, que ce concours spécial a prévenu et enveloppé toute l'activité des écrivains sacrés, en sorte qu'il est impossible de discerner dans leurs œuvres ce qui vient uniquement de Dieu et ce qui vient uniquement de l'homme. Tout vient à la fois de l'un et de l'autre ” (p. 57).

We shall see later on how well this doctrine of inspiration consorts with the presence of imperfection and inaccuracies within the Sacred Books, and how ingeniously the true Bible demands for its correct interpretation the Infallible Church. It is also fairly obvious how the human side of the Bible provides criticism with a province in which to work. Whether the divine side does not set up looming barriers—“Thus far and no farther”—may perhaps strike some readers with equal force. Meanwhile I wonder whether the orthodox Jewish divines would agree with M. Loisy's doctrine. It is true that to attempt a separation of the human and the divine elements is both difficult and even unfair. It will not do to pick out all the gems (i. e. whatever seems *to you* to be true and good) and to say, “This is the divine part of the Bible; all the rest is human.” For one thing, a great deal which you thus call human may be clad with supernatural sanctions, put into the mouth of God, and attested by miracles. It will not do, as M. Loisy says (quoting a certain M. Dausch, a German Roman Catholic priest, who has written a book on Biblical inspiration), “to vivisection” the Scripture. But from a higher point of view it may be doubted whether the attempted vivisection is not as near the truth as we can go. The inspiration of the Bible will always present insuperable difficulties, so long as the Bible is marked off from all other books. To suppose that Esther and Ezra are inspired but that the *Republic* and the *Antigone* are not, is revolting to our common sense. M. Loisy truly says that the divine “concours” and the divine “opérations” escape our analysis. Either we believe in this co-operation or we do not. But even if we do, we cannot explain it or put our finger upon its exact location. To say that in the Bible all comes at once both from God and man seems to me to be one of those generalities like “God rules the world” or “Nothing happens

in the world without the foreknowledge and the permission of God." Therefore in a sense God permits, therefore he is responsible for, sin and madness, misery and crime. Yes; but in spite of the logical difficulties, we shall continue to assert that in a special sense he is the author of goodness and of truth, even as he himself is true and good. And therefore whatever has done good in the world, or whatever our God-given reason makes us believe to be good and true, that we shall continue to regard as the gift of God. In this higher and fairer sense—even though it may also be charged with vagueness and looseness—we shall assert with Plato that what is divine is divine because it is good, and that it is not good because a creed or a church declares that it is divine¹.

We do not seem to get to liberty till we realize and are satisfied with the position that *in kind* the Bible is "inspired" in the same way that other good and true books are inspired, but that *in degree* of inspiration it excels them all. It would be interesting to know whether modern Jewish divines accept M. Loisy's view or mine, or whether they adopt a third view which differs from us both.

But the Church and the Popes have apparently declared not merely that the Bible is inspired, but that it is without error. What does that mean²?

It does not mean, first of all, that the traditional ascription of particular books to particular persons is true. "Jamais jusqu'à ce jour l'Église n'a défini que tel livre de la Bible appartient à tel auteur ou qu'il a été composé de telle manière" (p. 16). Thus it is not in the least necessary to believe that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Here is a pleasant bit of liberty at a stroke, whereat many a Jewish divine will probably sigh with envy. But how about mistakes as regards facts? Of these, even apart from miracles, there are a large number in the Bible.

I do not quite understand how M. Loisy deals with them. As regards *scientific* mistakes he is clear enough. Science is not the object of the revealed teaching contained in the Bible, and therefore scientific errors are not errors in the theological or ecclesiastical

¹ *Euthyphro*, 10 E—a passage to the deep significance of which Ranke has called attention: *Weltgeschichte*, i. 2, p. 75.

² The words of the present Pope's encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, are very strong and definite: "At nefas omnino fuerit, aut inspirationem ad aliquas tantum sacrae Scripturae partes coangustare, aut concedere sacrum ipsum errasse auctorem." And again: "Fideliter teneant . . . nihil ex rerum natura, nihil ex historiae monumentis colligi posse quod cum Scripturis revera pugnet."

meaning of the term (*Études*, pp. 32, 60). They are merely the human imperfection to which the divine truth was adapted. None of the Biblical writers meant or wanted to write a lesson in astronomy. This seems satisfactory as regards science, and it almost (though not quite) removes the difficulty from accepting the "inerrancy" of (say) Gen. i-xi. But the matter is more difficult when we come to historical narratives. For instance, M. Loisy would not, I imagine, accept the wise men of the East or the massacre of the innocents or the Gadarene swine as historical facts. If not facts, are they errors? Are we to believe that Elisha made iron swim, or that Elijah went up in a chariot of fire to heaven, or that the Spirit of God descended like a dove, or that Jesus walked upon the sea? And yet these things are recorded as facts. M. Loisy does not tell us definitely whether he believes in these stories or not: in fact the question of miracles is not discussed or mooted. But yet criticism does not stop short of them. Criticism says that miracles are the frequent and customary characteristic of religious revivals and of spiritual excitement. And stories such as those mentioned above it simply brushes aside. They are not facts, but legends or misreported anecdotes, or symbols turned into stories, or spiritual truths materialized, or delusions or visions or inventions. They are not facts in the sense that the battles of Hastings or Carchemish are believed to be facts.

Whether such criticism is rationalist and Protestant, or whether it is legitimate M. Loisy does not clearly inform us. He chiefly confines himself to the comfortable limits of Genesis. His canons for the detection of errors which are not "errors" in the theological sense seem to be these (the formulation is mine):—

(1) An error is not an error when the sacred writer did not definitely intend to teach it. (This test, as we have seen, disposes of all scientific "errors.")

(2) An error is not an error when it is merely adopted for the purpose of conveying a truth, or when the sacred writer did not intend it to be regarded as a fact or truth.

(3) An error is not an error when it is only an adaptation of truth to the moral and religious capacity of the time when it was written or told.

(4) An error is not an error when it is in accordance with the literary habits of the age.

I am not sure whether we might not add:—

(5) An error is not an error when it was written in good faith and has no relation to the real object or subject of revelation.

The first three canons suffice for the first eleven chapters of Genesis, but after all these are comparatively easy. I fancy no

Jewish Rabbi would mind saying that he did not believe in the Deluge or in the Tower of Babel or in Adam and Eve. The trouble only begins with Abraham. Of the first eleven chapters M. Loisy says that "ils ne se présentent pas comme historiques." Hence from the historical point of view they contain neither truth nor error. (*La Religion d'Israël*, pp. 8, 9, 15; *Études*, pp. 29, 71, &c.) I take M. Loisy to imply that J and P and the Redactor did not mean their stories of the creation and of paradise and so on to be taken as historical narratives, but that they only meant them to teach certain general truths with regard to God and to the world and to the early history of man. But this assumption is itself extremely doubtful. The latest and the most brilliant commentator of Genesis strongly denies it. He holds most emphatically that the tellers and hearers of Israelite legend, like tellers and hearers of legends elsewhere, believed them to be true. (This belief would surely extend as far as J, though we may perhaps hesitate as to P and the Redactor.) The legends and myths give in full earnest the explanation or reason of present and actual phenomena: *because* the woman was taken out of the man's rib, *therefore* man yearns for her society: to its teller the story was no poetic dressing up of an idea, but a fact that had actually occurred¹.

But passing beyond Gen. i-xi, it will not be denied that the authors of the narratives concerning Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses regarded them as facts, and not as mere vehicles or instruments for moral and religious truths. How M. Loisy regards them he indicates thus:—

"Disons tout de suite que l'histoire d'Israël est relativement claire depuis Samuel et Saül; auparavant, en remontant jusqu'à Moïse quelques points se détachent en demi-jour sur un fond obscur; avant Moïse et jusqu'à Abraham, on discerne vaguement dans l'ombre quelques figures indécises; avant Abraham c'est la nuit complète." (*La Religion d'Israël*, p. 14.)

These words must, I take it, mean that the large majority of the statements made about Abraham and Moses are not accurate; in other words they are errors. But if so, why are they not errors in the bad sense? The first three canons do not here apply; the fourth explains away the "erroneous" attribution of the Pentateuchal laws to Moses, but, in the case before us, is inapplicable. We are left with the fifth, but I am bound to say that I do not find the fifth definitely stated or even clearly implied. I am not sure that our author would desire to adopt it.

¹ Gunkel's *Genesis*, p. xviii and elsewhere.

Moses is not so important to M. Loisy as he would be to a Jewish divine, but he is not without his claims and his difficulties. For it seems that—

“Il importe à la vérité surnaturelle de la religion israélite que la tradition concernant Moïse ait une base historique incontestable, et il suit de là que l'historicité de la tradition est réclamée pour la preuve de la foi.” (*Études*, p. 105.)

It is difficult to gather whether we have to believe that *anything* of the present Pentateuch was written down by Moses himself (p. 95). The great mass of laws is certainly far later, but in their case, as in the case of the speeches put into Moses' mouth, “en faisant parler Moïse, l'auteur avait conscience d'interpréter comme il le fallait dans le présent la pensée du législateur. Le procédé n'a rien que de conforme aux habitudes de l'antiquité.” Hence so far as the “Mosaic” laws and speeches are concerned, the error is covered and sanctioned by the second and fourth canons, and possibly by the fifth also. I have a far higher opinion of P than most (Protestant) critics, but I am bound to say that it seems to me very doubtful whether many of his laws were not put into the mouth of Moses merely in order to get them adopted. And if P and his school thought that all their laws were Mosaic in the sense that they were true to the Mosaic spirit, they intended the people to regard them as Mosaic in a more literal and less accurate sense.

The case of Moses seems therefore to strain the elasticity of M. Loisy's canons very uncomfortably. I cannot but be grateful that my own personal religion, which I choose to call Reformed Judaism, is entirely unaffected by the question whether Moses did or did not do any of the things which the Bible says he did, or whether he said any of the words which the Bible puts into his mouth, or uttered or wrote any of the laws which the Bible ascribes to him. I admit that if the whole story of Moses were deliberate invention from beginning to end, it would be hard to separate the many noble and true things in the Pentateuch from the alloy of fraud; but such deliberate invention is of course a ridiculous hypothesis. Yet without any such foolish hypothesis, the uncertainty as to what Moses said or did must always remain extreme, and though critics may continue to believe that such a person as Moses really existed and that he was the true founder of the Yahwistic religion, such broad and general statements go a very little way towards establishing the accuracy and truth of the stories about him in the Pentateuch.

M. Loisy has not much to say about the “inaccuracies” in all the other portions of the Bible, and what he does say is by no means wholly clear. So far as I understand him, he seems to imply that

where the writer or redactor adopts a traditional story or statement he is not responsible for its truth. He may even tell two contradictory versions of the same event of which only one can possibly be true, as for example the two accounts of the origin of the Israelite monarchy, or of David's acquaintance with Saul. In such cases, where the sacred writers merely borrow from current stories or chronicles, they are not responsible for their accuracy. The errors of the sources are not *their* errors, and hence we have here but one more instance where an error in the Bible is not a Biblical error. It is not an error in the technical sense of the word; it has no theological significance (*Études*, p. 57 n.). To my own mind such explanations possess little value or meaning, but if they honestly bring back many a doubting heart to religion and to God, who shall say that they are without their use? Nor must we forget that those who profit by such resting-places or crutches, call them by what metaphor we will, may lead nobler lives of deeper religious intensity than those who need them not. What after all does God care whether we accept these compromises or no? He looks to what we do and are, we must suppose. Not till the life is equal, may we liberals and reformers boast.

So much about facts. More interesting and no less important is the question about opinions and doctrine. Here M. Loisy takes up a position which is in many respects closely analogous to that assumed by many liberal Protestants. Revelation grew: it culminated in Christ. The teaching of the Old Testament is not erroneous, but it may often be imperfect. It was germinal teaching, providentially adapted to the needs and capacities of the time. It needs interpretation and even correction, whether by way of curtailment or expansion. The interpreter or corrector is the Infallible Church.

"Par ce côté relatif de la Bible la révélation se trouvait proportionnée aux besoins des temps où elle s'est produite" (*Études*, p. 36).

"La doctrine révélée ressemble à un germe précieux qui vit et grandit" (p. 52).

"Aux époques toutes primitives, la vérité révélée s'est moulée dans les contours d'une pensée presque enfantine" (p. 25).

The imperfections of the Bible were a condition of its success, "on pourrait dire une qualité indispensable. En ce sens, on peut dire que ces imperfections contribuaient à rendre la Bible vraie pour le temps où elle a paru" (p. 54 fin.).

Such statements as these are familiar to every one. How a growing revelation came to a stop at a particular moment, and whether there are not many imperfections in the New Testament as well as in the Old, I will not inquire. On these crucial points, liberal but orthodox

Christians, and Jews, whether orthodox or reform, will never convince or even (probably) understand each other. But it is interesting to notice the special turns which M. Loisy gives to his general propositions.

The Bible, we must remember, is inerrant in this sense, that we never find in it "the formal teaching of any error presented as divine truth" (*Études*, p. 34).

M. Loisy applies this canon to his favourite subject, the first eleven chapters of Genesis. I hardly think they will stand the test. First of all there are other doctrines in the eleven chapters than those mentioned by M. Loisy. Secondly, of those mentioned by M. Loisy not all are true. On the one hand, for instance, the doctrine of the Divine Envy—the *φθόνος* of the Greeks—is distinctly enunciated in those chapters; on the other hand, the doctrine of "la déchéance primitive" is surely not true. Who nowadays believes in the Fall? It might also be argued that the teachings which M. Loisy elicits from the stories of Genesis are very much sublimated. Genesis à la Gunkel and Genesis à la Loisy seem different things. To this objection, however, our author has a very ingenious reply. It is for the Church to discriminate between the envelope and the truth, it is for the Church moreover to add or to supplement.

"Il est certain que l'interprétation traditionnelle des textes scripturaires, surtout quand il s'agit de l'Ancien Testament, ajoute presque toujours quelque chose au sens vraiment littéral, au sens perçu par les écrivains sacrés La vérité contenue dans l'Écriture a reçu au cours des siècles une expression plus nette et acquis un développement plus large" (pp. 21, 22).

Does this observation cover, for example, the Old Testament teaching on the subject of immortality or the New Testament teaching on the person of Christ? One can understand that it might possibly cover the second, but how can it cover the first? If the prophets constantly predict that the Messianic age is near at hand, it may perhaps do to say that "l'imminence du règne messianique était un effet de perspective qui avait ses raisons providentielles et psychologiques." But when a Biblical author flatly denies the doctrine of resurrection or immortality, it is hard to see how such emphatic statements can be got over by saying that "Job, les Psaumes, l'Écclésiaste ne contredisent pas doctrinalement l'enseignement des livres plus récents; ils correspondent à un degré moins élevé de la révélation divine" (p. 57).

An observer who stands outside the Catholic Church almost wonders why the Popes should not go a step or two further. Why should they not allow that there *are* errors in the Bible, not merely

errors that do not count, but real errors; theological errors, historic errors, religious errors, moral errors? Such an admission would make the necessity of the interpreting Church still greater. For even if there were a few downright errors, there would remain a great residuum of truth, and so our author might still say: "La Bible reste vraie, comme le croyaient les Pères, vraie à condition d'être interprétée. La Bible est vraie, mais l'Église est infaillible." He could still make his excellent and telling point: "La critique fait ainsi l'apologie de l'Église contre les sectes fondées sur l'autorité de la Bible seule." He could still aver that the few errors are of no consequence, "puisque le magistère perpétuel de l'Église est là pour discerner infailliblement, sous l'antique enveloppe où elle nous est transmise, la vérité contenue dans l'Écriture" (pp. 58, 59, 36).

The infallible Church, if one could accept that dogma, interpreting in just accordance with the religious needs and capacities of every age, a Bible true in the main, but not true in every statement and detail, is rather an attractive picture! Apart from every *souçon* of irony, one cannot but admire the honest efforts of M. Loisy to reconcile both for himself and for others the demands of criticism and reason with the requirements of his faith. It is surely not inconsistent on the part of a Jewish reviewer to express the hope that these efforts may be successful. Liberality in exegesis and liberality in thought usually go together. It is highly improbable that the author of the *Études Bibliques* could be a reactionary and a bigot in any department of life. Therefore the more the Catholic Church is leavened by such men as he, the better for the Church and for the world. What the ultimate result of such leavening may be, no man can foretell. Finally, I would once more repeat that M. Loisy's writings suggest many special reflections for Jewish as well as for Christian readers. If the Catholic Church can produce a believing divine like M. Loisy, who is ready to speak his mind and say a word in season, should Judaism remain behind?

C. G. MONTEFIORE.